

## Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1 – 7 are under consideration.

### *CLAIM OBJECTIONS*

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 because it recites non-elected SEQ ID NOs. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the recitation to non-elected SEQ ID NOs. Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

### *THE §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph alleging that the Specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to practice the invention commensurate with the scope of the claims as filed. The Examiner stated that the Specification does not reasonably provide enablement for isolated soluble receptor comprising SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:15. Specifically, the Examiner has alleged that although the Specification has disclosed how to make a heterodimer comprising the full-length IL-20 receptor subunits and immunoglobulin, it fails to disclose whether said heterodimer is functional; nor does it disclose how to make the soluble receptor of claim 1.

Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's statement. However, in order to expedite prosecution and allowance of the present invention, Applicants have amended claim 1 to now recite "an isolated IL-20 receptor" that comprises the full-length IL-20 receptor subunits. Applicants are in no way disclaiming any subject matter and reserve the right to prosecute these claims at a later date. Accordingly, in light of the above amendments, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

### *THE §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS*

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph alleging that claim 5 is indefinite for reciting "at least one cysteine residue."

Foster *et al.*

Response to the March 9, 2005 Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 5 to now recite "wherein each of said polypeptide linkers comprise one cysteine residue." In light of the present amendment, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 6 and claim 7, as dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph alleging that claim 6 is indefinite for reciting "subunit is fused to all or a portion of the constant region."

Applicants have amended claim 6, and hence claim 7, to now recite "fused to the constant region." In light of the present amendment, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

### CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 1, 2005



Shelby J. Walker, Reg. No. 45,192  
Attorney for Applicants  
c/o ZYMOGENETICS, INC.  
1201 Eastlake Avenue East  
Seattle, Washington 98102-3702  
Tel: (206) 442-6558  
Fax: (206) 442-6678

Enclosures:

Petition and Fee for Extension of Time (in duplicate)  
Amendment Fee Transmittal (in duplicate)  
Postcard

H:\Patents\Shelby\99-107\US\Response to the March 9 2005 Office Action.doc